

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,330	03/30/2001	Mutsumi Ikeda	263/131	8123

26389 7590 08/26/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

SUAZO, RAINIER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,330

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Rainier Suazo

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1-19 presented for examination.

Objections

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The drawings are objected to because of the use of improper margin (37 CFR 1.84). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures

appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson.

4. Regarding claim 1, Kiraly teaches an intelligent assistant for use with a local computer and with the Internet. The invention further describe an "utterance identification block with an electronic collection of anticipated user utterances" in the form of an assistant that respond to various text, voice, and mouse gestures commands (Abstract) and a voice recognition device 107 used to provide input to the assistant by converting words into text. Speech is digitized and then matched against a dictionary of coded waveforms (column 6 lines 62-66). Kiraly teaches a "response block" describing that the intelligent assistant communicates with the user in various ways (e.g. through text, voice, and animation) (column 7 lines 9-43). Figure 5B depicts an intelligent assistant commands list that defines "an electronic collection of action patterns for an agent". Kiraly teaches a "search unit" searching the requested information

Art Unit: 2144

among a plurality of information providers in claim; 1 claiming a computer system having a method for collecting site information from and Internet site (column 16 lines 19-22). Kiraly teaches a central processor but failed to teach the execution a process for prioritizing the information providers. Anderson teaches systems and methods for arranging records in search results, the determination of whether to arrange the records is an automatic positive determination based on factors such as characteristics associated with the search results, association of the record with a client or other entity, weighting factors, preferred record status and other (Abstract, Fig. 4, column 15 lines 36-67 and column 16 lines 1-44).

Among Anderson's reasons to arrange search results is the user satisfaction improvement by obtaining results that take into account user's preferences, since satisfaction is a high priority for service providers of information retrieval systems (Column 21 lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Anderson with Kiraly's teachings to enhance customer satisfaction of the users of an information retrieval system.

45). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of common knowledge in the art as depicted in "Groupby after merging two tables" and "Doubts/queries about Entity Bean".

46). Kiraly failed to teach the incorporation of two collections of utterances. It is well know in the art that the incorporating, merging or joining two or more tables containing common vectors (columns) results in saving of storage space.

Art Unit: 2144

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use well known techniques in the art with Kiraly to obtain the claimed invention.

47). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson.

48). Regarding claim 3, Kiraly failed to teach a failed to teach a process unit that arranges information related to a specific information provider at the top of a list of search results obtained by the search unit. Anderson teaches methods and systems ordering records in a search result placing certain type of records at first on a particular set of search results (column 21 lines 50-3). Among Anderson's reasons to arrange search results is the user satisfaction improvement to obtain results that take into account user's preferences, since satisfaction is a high priority for service providers of information retrieval systems (Column 21 lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Anderson with Kiraly's teachings to enhance the customer satisfaction of the user of an information retrieval system.

49). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as

Art Unit: 2144

Anderson and further in view of Vijayan et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,535,888) hereinafter referenced to as Vijayan.

50). Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a process unit that emphasizes information related to a specific information provider when a search result obtained by the information search unit is presented to the user. Vijayan teaches a system and method for visually and functionally extending the reach of web sites wherein advertisers can automatically update their site features to highlight special product or service offerings (Column 7 lines 3-11, column 12 lines 53-60). The use of features (column 6 lines 22-37) to highlight or promote specific products or services provides advertisers with an alternative to overcome

drawbacks of traditional banner ads and irrelevant search results, which represents a more affective way to attract new customers online (column 2 lines 5-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Vijayan with Kiraly in view of Anderson to overcome drawbacks of traditional banner ads and irrelevant search results.

51). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of International Business Machines Corporation (Research Disclosure Database Number 429147) hereinafter referenced to as IBM.

52). Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a process unit that displays a search result with an advertisement attached to it. IBM teaches an invention that selects

Art Unit: 2144

key advertisements in text form and intersperse them evenly with the normal search data base results (page 2). This technique is intended to make people more likely to read advertisements entries, among other benefits (page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine IBM with Kiraly in view of Anderson to overcome drawbacks of traditional banner ads and make people more likely to read the advertisement.

53). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Shultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) hereinafter referenced to as Shultz.

54). Kiraly combined with Anderson failed to teach a process unit monitoring an updating status of a particular type of information and notifying the user of such status when the information is updated. Schultz disclosed a system and method for presenting data from a plurality of sources to a user. The user may be notified via e-mail or message to a channel when a particular event occurs (Abstract, FIGS. 1-3, column 13 lines 19-33). In claim 10 Shultz describes a method with an automated process that alerts a user when a particular event occurs. Shultz background information teaches increased burden to find relevant information and unavailability of information to decisions makers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Shultz's invention with Kiraly in view of Anderson to ease

Art Unit: 2144

access of a user to information minimizing the burden of finding relevant data with such automated monitoring.

55). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Vijayan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,535,888 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Vijayan.

56). Kiraly combined with Anderson failed to teach a charging unit which charges an information provider granted a high priority. Vijayan teaches a system and method for visually and functionally extending the reach of web sites

wherein advertisers have more effective ways to interact with customers online (abstract, column 2 lines 9-12). In one of the preferred embodiments, advertisers bid for priority placement and only pay the amount of their bid when a consumer or potential consumer clicks-through the preview to go to their site (column 12 lines 7-21, column 16 lines 14-20). Vijayan's bid system represents a more affective way to attract new customers online (column 2 lines 5-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Vijayan with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain a more effective way to attract customers online with a bid system that charges when priority is granted.

57). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in

Art Unit: 2144

view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson.

58). Kiraly failed to teach a setting unit which allows a user to register a specific information provider to be granted high priority. Anderson teaches systems and methods for arranging records in search results, the determination of whether to arrange the records is an automatic positive determination based on factors such as characteristics associated with the search results, association of the record with a client or other entity, weighting factors, preferred record status and other (Abstract, Fig. 4, column 15 lines 36-67 and column 16 lines 1-44). In addition Anderson teaches that a determination as to the type of ordered records for the arrangement may be an automatic positive determination that follows on a selective positive determination with respect to arranging the records of a particular set of search results into ordered records (column 16 lines 10-17). Anderson's method also provide that the determination as to the type of ordered records for a particular set of search results be made on a case by case basis, rather than be an automatic selection of type of ordered records (column 16 lines 27-30). Among Anderson's reasons to arrange search results is the user satisfaction improvement to obtain results that take into account user's preferences, since satisfaction is a high priority for service providers of information retrieval systems (Column 21 lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Anderson with Kiraly to enhance customer satisfaction of the users of an information retrieval system.

Art Unit: 2144

59). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Kelly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,454,648) hereinafter referenced to as Kelly.

60). Kiraly failed to teach an award unit awarding the user a merit when the user registers an information provider for high priority. Kelly teaches a system, method and article of manufacture for providing a progressive prize awarding. (abstract). In claim 10 Kelly depicts a method for providing a progressive prize awarding that determine the final prize credit value at the end of the user's game, therefore depending on user's actions (column 20 lines 58-67 and column 21

lines 1-3). Kelly teaches that progressive prizing is a powerful tool for enticing users to use a gaming system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Kelly with Kiraly to entice and attract users to use the system.

61). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Gupta et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0020242 A1) hereinafter referenced to as Gupta.

62). Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a library providing unit which offers the user utterance library to a third party off line or on line. Gupta teaches a method and apparatus for processing user information, in particular information that can be used by advertisers to determine user's individual preferences (abstract).

Art Unit: 2144

Gupta teaches that alternatively, the profile information may be sold to a third party such as an advertiser. In claims 46-48 Gupta claims a computer program product that process client information related to a client, customize the information based on client information and transmit it to a third party (Abstract, page 3 paragraph 5, page 5 paragraph 4, page 6 paragraph 12 and page 8 claims 46-48). Gupta teaches that the profile information may be sold, therefore providing the motivation of obtaining money in exchange for the information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Gupta with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain money in exchange for the information contained in the user's profiles.

63). Claim 11-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Herz et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

64). Regarding claim 12, Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a plurality of apparatuses connected to a network each apparatus corresponding to one specialized field and holding it's particular collections of utterances and actions customized for the particular apparatus field. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper; one variation of the system depicts core servers containing objects related to clusters (column 51 lines 24-36). Each server holds a collection of related objects required to provide search results to a user's inquiry and each server is considered to be

Art Unit: 2144

independent in its response capacity to request as explained in column 52 lines 42-54. Herz teaches that the clusters and core serves arrangements provide substantial advantages in computational efficiency (column 51 lines 31-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain the substantial computational advantages of the core servers and cluster arrangements.

65). Regarding claims 11 and 16, Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a recording unit which obtains a record of the user's access and a response block that chooses one from a plurality of choices of the action patterns of the agent to respond to the user utterance depending on the user's access record. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper comprising means for automatically generating at least one user target profile interest summary for a user at a user terminal, each summary being generated from said target object profiles associated with said news articles and advertisements accessed by said user (column 80 lines 52-57 and column 81 lines 23-51). Regarding the response block choosing one from a plurality of choices of the action patterns is inherited in the agent that its controlled by a computer readable code with predetermined actions patterns and that the selection of any pattern for response is based on certain condition being met. Herz teaches that the invention is solution to the existing problem in the electronic media to enable a user to access information of relevance and interest to the user without the user to expend an excessive amount of time and energy

Art Unit: 2144

searching for the information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to customize the response of a user inquiry based on user's access record to provide relevant results without expending excessive amount of time and energy searching for information.

66). Regarding claim 13, Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a plurality of apparatuses sharing the utterance identification block and having other units such as the response blocks therein. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper (abstract). Herz teaches the use of proxy servers as a possible way to contact the core servers in case it is not the

one of the corresponding core servers for a particular field of the request (column 52 lines 42-49). Herz also teaches that the first function of the proxy server is to bidirectional transfer communications between user U and other entities (column 32 lines 37-50). This configuration shares the proxy server which interprets and forward requests which are front end processing functions like those performed by the utterance identification block. Herz teaches the use of the proxy server as a security measure of the invention to protect user's profile information (Abstract), however it is important to note that the Herz implementation clearly relates to failure tolerance systems and front end processing in load balancing systems architecture, therefore providing additional benefits and motivations to use such implementation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the Herz with Kiraly in

Art Unit: 2144

view of Anderson obtain increased security and additional benefits of Herz's implementation.

67). Regarding claim 14, Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach an index storage with an index for the user utterance collection therein and searching the index first. Herz a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper (Abstract). Herz teaches the proxy server storing pseudonym information indexed by P (column 37 lines 40-52). Herz comments about prior art that used clustering methods for the purpose of files (column 3 lines 36—39). Herz teaches a method that clusters articles based on their similarity and that is applicable to large sets of articles (column 2 lines 40-49). Clustering information for easing its retrieval matches the index definition providing something that serves to guide, point out, or otherwise facilitate reference. Herz teaches that the invention is solution to the existing problem in the electronic media to enable a user to access information of relevance and interest to the user without the user to expend an excessive amount of time and energy searching for the information (column 1 lines 46-49); clustering searched objects shorten the time required to find relevant information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to cluster or index large amounts of information to improve information retrieval and provide relevant results without expending excessive amount of time and energy searching for information.

68). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in

Art Unit: 2144

view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Gupta et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0020242 A1) hereinafter referenced to as Gupta and further in view of Herz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

69). Gupta combined with Kiraly and Anderson teaches a user support apparatus with a library providing unit. Gupta combined with Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a library providing unit which offers the user utterance library to a third party off line or on line in a multiple node networked environment of user support apparatuses. Herz teaches system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper; one variation of the system depicts core servers containing objects related to clusters (column 51 lines 24-36). Each server holds a collection of related objects required to provide search results to a user's inquiry. Each server is considered to be independent in its response capacity to request as explained in column 52 lines 42-54. Herz teaches that the clusters and core serves arrangements provide substantial advantages in computational efficiency. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Gupta combined Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain the substantial computational advantages of the core servers and cluster arrangements.

70). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as

Art Unit: 2144

Anderson and further in view of Herz et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

71). Kiraly in view of Anderson teach a process unit that arranges information related to a particular type at the top of a list of search results obtained by the search unit. Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a plurality of apparatuses connected to a network each apparatus corresponding to one specialized field and holding it's particular collections of utterances and actions customized for the particular apparatus field. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper; one variation of the system depicts core servers containing objects related to clusters (column 51 lines 24-36). Each server holds a collection of related objects required to provide search results to a user's inquiry. Each server is considered to be independent in its response capacity to request as explained in column 52 lines 42-54. Herz teaches that the clusters and core serves arrangements provide substantial advantages in computational efficiency. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain the substantial computational advantages of the core servers and cluster arrangements.

72). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of Vijayan et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,535,888)

Art Unit: 2144

hereinafter referenced to as Vijayan and further in view of Herz et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

73). Vijayan combined with Kiraly and Anderson teach a process unit that emphasizes information related to a specific information provider when a search result obtained by the information search unit is presented to the user. Vijayan combined Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a plurality of apparatuses connected to a network each apparatus corresponding to one specialized field and holding it's particular collections of utterances and actions customized for the particular apparatus field. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper; one variation of the system depicts core servers containing objects related to clusters (column 51 lines 24-36). Each server holds a collection of related objects required to provide search results to a user's inquiry. Each server is considered to be independent in its response capacity to request as explained in column 52 lines 42-54. Herz teaches that the clusters and core serves arrangements provide substantial advantages in computational efficiency. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain the substantial computational advantages of the core servers and cluster arrangements.

74). Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,731) hereinafter referenced to as Kiraly in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent Number 6,415,281) hereinafter referenced to as Anderson and further in view of International Business Machines Corporation

Art Unit: 2144

(Research Disclosure Database Number 429147) hereinafter referenced to as IBM and further in view of Herz et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

75). IBM combined with Kiraly and Anderson teaches a process unit that displays a search result with an advertisement attached to it. IBM combined with Kiraly and Anderson failed to teach a plurality of apparatuses connected to a network each apparatus corresponding to one specialized field and holding its particular collections of utterances and actions customized for the particular apparatus field. Herz teaches a system for providing a user with a customized electronic newspaper; one variation of the system depicts core servers

containing objects related to clusters (column 51 lines 24-36). Each server holds a collection of related objects required to provide search results to a user's inquiry. Each server is considered to be independent in its response capacity to request as explained in column 52 lines 42-54. Herz teaches that the clusters and core serves arrangements provide substantial advantages in computational efficiency. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Herz with Kiraly in view of Anderson to obtain the substantial computational advantages of the core servers and cluster arrangements.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2144

U.S. Patent no. 5,870,740 by Rose et al. teaches a system and method for improving the ranking of information retrieval results for short queries.

U.S. Patent no. 6,184,996 B1 by Gase The method of the invention enables remote control of a print queue in a network printer which receives print jobs over the internet from a plural client processors and teaches steps for altering the queue according to status requests from the client processors.

U.S. Patent no. 6,460,037 by Weiss et al. teaches an agent-based data mining and warehousing networking system.

U.S. Patent no. 6,735,632 by Kiraly et al. teaches an intelligent assistant for use with a local computer and with the Internet.

U.S. Patent no. 5,875,446 by Brown et al. teaches a system a system and method for hierarchically grouping and ranking a set of objects in a query context based on one or more relationships.

U.S. Patent no. 6,131,085 by Rossides et al. teaches a invention which is a set of processes for improving the interface of a self-organizing database.

U.S. Patent no. 5,754,939 by Herz et al. teaches a system related to customize electronic identification of desirable objects, in an electronic media environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rainier Suazo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2144

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800